



Attorney Docket No.: 2745/FBR (031035-87536)

#13
K. Cobb
5/14/03
N.E.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: DAVID TIMPERLEY
Serial No.: 09/369,804
Filed: August 6, 1999
Title: GAMING CONSOLES WITH TRANSPARENT SPRITES
Examiner: VISHU K. MENDIRATTA
Group Art Unit: 3711

April 30, 2003

Box AF
Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D. C. 20231

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

SIR:

Applicant hereby petitions for a one-month extension of time, a petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) and a requisite fee being enclosed.

In response to the Office Action dated December 31, 2002, please amend the subject application as follows:

Any fee due with this paper may be
charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Filed by Express Mail
Receipt No. EV 33228095445
on 4-30-2003
pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.10.
By Frances Doyle

REMARKS

Claims 1-49 are pending in the application. Claims 1-49 are rejected.

It is respectfully requested the finality of the Office Action of December 31, 2002 be withdrawn. The prior Office Action of January 18, 2001 improperly rejected claims 1-12 and 16-28 as anticipated by Inoue with no patent number or other reference given as to what Inoue was referring to. In the Notice of References cited by the Examiner, two Inoue references were listed 5,752,881 and US 5,395,111, however there was no indication as to which reference the rejection was referring to. Because it was unclear as to what reference was being used to reject the claims, Applicant should be afforded the opportunity of having received two proper rejections.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-12 and 16-28 are rejected as being anticipated and/or rendered obvious in light of Inoue (US 5,395,111).

Inoue describes mechanical reels having indicia displayed on the outer surface thereof with an innermost reel having its indicia able to be viewed through the outermost reel since the outer reel is transparent, allowing the gaming symbols of the inner reel to be seen through the outer reel, and therefore allowing a range of "combination" symbols to be formed.

There are several patentable distinguishing features between the present claimed invention and Inoue. First Applicant claims: a plurality of symbols are randomly selected and displayed on the display means.

The Office Action admits that in Inoue “[T]he second set of symbols are fixed, static, have graphics in window.” This is different from applicant’s claimed invention where a plurality of symbols are randomly selected and displayed on the display means.

Inoue teaches in col. 3 lines 50-54 that the order of disposing symbols on the outer reel is fixed. The Figs. also show the inner reel is fixed.

The prior art teaches the second set of image is fixed while in contrast applicant’s first image and a second image component are randomly selected.

Second nowhere does Inoue teach first image component is visible through the second image component. Inoue does not describe the one symbol seen through the other symbol as asserted. What the Abstract of Inoue states is “The outer reel has a transparent outer circumferential frame to allow a player to see symbols of the inner reel.” Further Inoue describes in the Abstract the combined symbol of superimposed inner and outer reel symbols is produced. Therefore Inoue teaches producing a combined symbol composed of the outer symbol and the inner symbol which is seen through the transparent outer circumferential frame of the outer reel.

This is supported by the Figs of Inoue and col. 4, lines 51-54 the inner reels and moving symbols can be observed through transparent outer circumferential frames of the outer reels. Further col. 4, lines 30-34 “The symbols on the outer reels 5a to 7a which move downward can be observed, and those on the inner reels 5b and 7b which move upward can be observed through the transparent outer reels 5a to 7a.” Again nowhere does Inoue teach first image component is visible through the second image component.

The images on the reels in Inoue are fixed and are not able to be randomly selected and displayed on a display means as in Applicant’s claims 1-12 and 16-28. It is respectfully

submitted in Inoue there is only a first image component that shows basic game features as the images on both reels are fixed. There is no disclosure of a second image component that displays non-basic image features that are additional to the game features of the first image component and where the second image component is superimposed on the first image component.

In the present invention there is a base game screen that displays all the basic game functionality, that is a first image component which displays basic game features. The basic game screen is still seen through the transparent sprite and therefore does not block the players view of any critical game information such as the symbols displayed on reels. This differs from Inoue as previously argued because the two reels in the Inoue patent just display components of the basic game, and the second reel displays its symbols through a transparent portion of the reel and not through the first image.

BENNETT

Claims 13, 29 and 32 to 47 as obvious over Inoue in view of US 6,089,977 (Bennett).

Bennett discloses an animated wild card invoked when a special triggering combination of symbols occurs. Accordingly, on the basis that the above arguments, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable over Inoue and Bennett.

In relation to the Bennett patent the differences between the features of at least claims 13, 29 and 32 to 47 and this document are that Bennett just covers a moving wild symbol. The wild symbol moves to different symbol locations on the screen as a part of the basic game and there is nothing in this document to suggest that it is transparent as claimed by applicant.

That is, the first image component is not visible through a second image component. In Bennett the moving wild symbol, the example given in that patent is a penguin, which moves

from a first portion of the screen, being the top left corner and moves through fifteen different positions to replace an original symbol. Once it moves from that position the original symbol is again displayed. When the moving wild symbol has finished its path a determination of how much a user wins is made and then displayed. As mentioned, the symbol that is covered by the moving wild symbol is totally removed while the wild symbol is in its position. There is no suggestion of transparency.

OKADA

Claims 14, 15, 30, 31, 48 and 49 are rejected as being obvious over Inoue in view of US 4,718,672 (Okada).

Okada cited by the Examiner (column 5, lines 55-65), appears not to disclose the features of the claimed invention and merely indicates win lines on a liquid crystal panel arranged in a three by three symbol matrix that under different conditions is either in a lit state or an unlit state.

The teaching in Inoue specifically relates to identifying effective winning lines on which a winning symbol array appears and this is done by optical means.

There is no suggestion that the second image component is transparent such that a first image component is visible through the second image component under the control of control means and no suggestion of displaying a first image component which displays basic game features and a second image component that displays non-basic image features that are superimposed on the first image component.

Also there is no suggestion of a game control means arranged to control images displayed on a display means such that a plurality of symbols are randomly selected and displayed. Most importantly

It is respectfully submitted there is no suggestion that a person skilled in the art would arrive at the invention claimed by combining the teachings of Inoue, Bennett and Okada. Given that all of the claims refer to the transparency of the second image component and there is no mention of this in either of Bennett or Okada and given that Inoue simply has two mechanical reels one of which is able to be seen through a portion of the other and it only relates to one game played, one skilled in the art could not arrive at the claimed invention.

Further one skilled in the art would not likely make such combination of the three references because such a combination would likely destroy the intended function of each of the references. For example in relation to Bennett one skilled in the art would not be led to make the wild card transparent because if the wild symbol in Bennett were made to be transparent then when it moved to a symbol position the existing symbol would be viewable through the wild symbol. Hence the original symbol would still be seen which would be a problem when calculating the wins for the game and its concept would be destroyed. That is, when the wild symbol moves to a symbol position, then wins including the wild symbol are paid, but if the underlying symbol could be seen and could create different winning combinations it would be a problem. That is it would either be misleading to the player or it would require a change to the mathematics of the game resulting in the game working differently to the Bennett invention.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the citations teach away from the invention. For example, as stated above the wild symbol in Bennett cannot be transparent as it would change the game and therefore Bennett teaches towards an opaque symbol. Inoue and Okada on the other hand teach the use of two separate display means by using physical layers which teach away from the invention where two images appear on a single display means.

The present invention solves the problem of critical game information being blocked by opaque foreground animations. Bennett on the other hand is merely a single game concept, Okada solves the problem of how to indicate win lines on a mechanical stepper machine and Inoue is a style of game for a mechanical stepper machine, all of which have for their purpose different problems to solve.

For at least the foregoing reasons it is respectfully submitted the rejections of claims 1-49 should be withdrawn.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman
575 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022-2585
(212) 940-8703
Docket No.: 2745/FBR (031035-87536)
BSM:fd